EXHIBIT G

2011.01.04 Trial Transcript Day 1 1/4/2011 2:49:00 PM

I	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	1	PROCEEDINGS
3	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA	2	
1	RICHMOND DIVISION	3	THE CLERK: Civil action number 3:09CV00620, ePlus,
5		4	Incorporated versus Lawson Software, Incorporated. Mr. Scott
6	ePLUS, INC. : Civil Action No.	5	L. Robertson, Mr. Craig T. Merritt, Ms. Jennifer A. Albert, Mr.
,	: 3:09CV620 vs. :	6	Michael G. Strapp, and Mr. David Young represent the plaintiff.
	:	7	Mr. Daniel W. McDonald, Dabney J. Carr, IV, Ms.
3	LAWSON SOFTWARE, INC. : January 4, 2011	8	Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, and Mr. William D. Schultz represent
9	·	9	the defendant. Are counsel ready to proceed?
0 1	COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF THE JURY TRIAL	10	MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, Your Honor, plaintiff is.
2	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. PAYNE	11	MR. McDONALD: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
3 4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, AND A JURY	12	THE COURT: All right. Good morning, ladies and
	APPEARANCES:	13	gentlemen. On behalf of the Court and counsel and the parties,
5	Scott L. Robertson, Esquire	14	I'd like to thank you for your participation this morning in
6	Michael G. Strapp, Esquire	15	one of the most important civic duties that citizens of our
7	Jennifer A. Albert, Esquire David M. Young, Esquire	16	country have.
	Goodwin Procter, LLP	17	We are a society which has chosen to rule itself in
8	901 New York Avenue NW Suite 900	18	accord with the rule of law, and we have taken in our
9	Washington, D.C. 20001	19	Constitution and our laws measures to make sure that we have an
0	Craig T. Merritt, Esquire Christian & Barton, LLP	20	effective legal system by which people can resolve their
1	909 East Main Street	21	disputes in court rather than in the streets, and if we did not
2	Suite 1200 Richmond, Virginia 23219-3095	22	have the service of jurors to make the sacrifices that jurors
	Counsel for the plaintiff	23	are called upon to do so, then our system of justice that is
3 4	Peppy Peterson, RPR	24	administered in accord with our Constitution and our statutes
	Official Court Reporter	25	could not exist.
ı	APPEARANCES: (cont'g)	2 1	And so what you are called upon to do is a public
2	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire	2	duty of the highest order which, of course, all of us know
	Troutman Sanders, LLP	3	entail sacrifices for you and for your families and for your
3	Troutman Sanders Building	4	employers and imposes burdens upon you beyond that of the
	1001 Haxall Point	5	ordinary responsibilities that you have which are already
ļ 5	Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire	6	significant, and all of us know that.
,	Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire	7	
6	William D. Schultz, Esquire		This case involves a dispute over patents. There
	Merchant & Gould, PC	8	are the plaintiff here is ePlus, Incorporated, or Inc., and
7	80 South Eighth Street	9	ePlus, whose lawyers are sitting over here, has some patents
2	Suite 3200	10	that are issued by the United States Patent Office, a process
3	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402	11	that is sanctioned and approved by the Constitution of the
0		12	country and the laws of the nation, and the patents all are
1		13	long-numbered.
2		14	They have six figures, and, in fact, I expect most of
3		15	us would like to earn incomes in accord with the size of the
4 5		16	numbers of these patents, but they are referred to by three
6		17	small digits, the last three digits of the patent. I don't
7		18	know that any of you know anything about these patents, but I
8		19	want to let you know and understand what these patents are.
		20	There's a patent number 6023683 which is called the
9		21	'683 patent. There's patent number 6055516 or the '516 patent.
0		22	There's patent number 6505172 or the '172 patent. Sometimes,
0 1			
0		23	patents may be referred to, instead of using these short
0 1 2			patents may be referred to, instead of using these short numbers, '516 or '683 as the patents-in-suit. That's just a term that lawyers sometimes use to talk about the patents that

2011.01.04 Trial Transcript Day 1 1/4/2011 2:49:00 PM

THE COURT: All right. Thank you 1 of items and associated information, published by a 1 2 vendor, which includes suppliers, manufacturers, and 2 I don't understand, Mr. Robertson, where they distributors, which preferably includes a part number, are going across the line. I really don't. MR. ROBERTSON: I'd like to just point out price, catalog number, vendor name, vendor ID, a 5 textual description of the item, and nothing else. the very same slide that was just mentioned by Ms. 6 MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Your Honor, we have that Stoll-DeBell Lawson does not infringe the ePlus exact definition as one of the slides they objected patent, says "Lawson does not have published 7 8 to. It is a quote of your claim construction of the 9 term "catalog." That is what we intend to use. We 9 THE COURT: Yeah. And they're not going to 10 intend to put on a non-infringement case that our 10 say that. They're not saying that, 11 product does not meet this definition. That is our 11 MR. ROBERTSON: Then I would expect this 12 non-infringement case. We've said this all along. 12 slide wouldn't be included. THE COURT: No. I just told them. I said Mr. McDonald said it at the Markman hearing 13 13 14 that we didn't have catalogs. We have like a shopping 14 they are not saying that. They are saying what I list for the grocery store, not a published catalog. 15 said, and that's it. 15 16 We said it in our non-infringement interrogatory MR. ROBERTSON: Thank you. Your Honor. 16 17 contentions. We don't have published catalogs. 17 THE COURT: And the other thing that we're 18 Dr. Shamus said it in his expert report. We 18 doing to do is we're not going to have the closing 19 don't have published catalogs. 19 argument in the opening statements. I don't want you THE COURT: I didn't say "published 20 20 getting into arguments about why people are wrong in 21 catalogs." I decided a collection of items and 21 making closing statements and what's wrong with the 22 associated information published by a vendor. That's 22 expert testimony. You can frame the issues in what 23 different than saying it's a published catalog. And 23 your expert is going to do. 24 24 you can't say "published catalog" with a view to The other thing is -- yes, Ms. Stoll-DeBell, conveying the notion that you have the Sears catalog, 25 what else? 25 102 104 and that's what we're talking about or anything else. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: I'm sorry. We will not 1 MS. STOLL-DeBELL: And I apologize. I say "published catalogs," but we do intend to argue 3 misspoke, Your Honor. If you look at our slides, we and we have disclosed all throughout this case, that say we do not have catalogs published by a vendor. our product is not published. It's not published at This is another slide that they used. That's what 5 5 all and is not published by a vendor. THE COURT: Well, you have to come up with Dr. Shamos used in his report. That exact language. 6 We don't have catalogs published by a vendor. some definition of "published" that doesn't include 8 THE COURT: You have Lawson does not infringe the written or the spoken word because that's what the ePlus patents? 9 9 I've said it belongs to. 10 MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Yes. And I can give you 10 I'm telling you, I want it understood --11 the paragraph of Dr. Shamos' report. I can cite you 11 whether I'm right or wrong, I don't know. I think I'm to of our interrogatory responses where we said we do right in the way I interpreted it. But I spent a lot 12 12 not have catalogs published by vendors. We do not 13 of time and effort, and so did you-all, in giving the 13 have multiple catalogs. We are arguing that we do not terms the meaning I thought they had. And that's 15 meet your definition of "catalog." 15 going to be the terms that are going to be used. And 16 THE COURT: I didn't say it had to be no amount of workaround is going to happen. multiple catalogs. I said it has to be an organized 17 And the consequence of a workaround is going 17 18 collection of items and associated information. That 18 to be this: If I find that you are just -- and I've 19 doesn't say "catalogs." 19 had this problem. I've never had to say this before. 20 MS. STOLL-DeBELL: The claims do. The claims 20 But if I find any more of what I've encountered, which 21 21 is trying to do indirectly what I've said you can't do call for a collection of catalogs, two or more catalogs, Your Honor. So you're right. Your directly, and I'm not talking about you personally, 23 definition is for a single catalog. If you look at 23 I'm talking about your side, then the consequence is the claim language, it actually calls for more than going to be is I'm inclined to grant a motion for 24 24 25 judgment as a matter of law for the other side on the

2011.01.04 Trial Transcript Day 1 1/4/2011 2:49:00 PM

ry that that's an appropriate sanction for ated disobedience of the Court's directives ause I can't conduct a trial being constantly on concern that somebody is trying to come in the door. Now, if I did it wrong, you-all have recourse at in the federal circuit, and that's fine, but I you to understand I don't deal with things that MS. STOLL-DeBELL: I understand, Your Honor, I would like to remind you this came up at the ial conference as well. We have not taken issue the meaning of the term "published." Dr. Weaver said that published means originated, and we did to cross-examine him on that. I asked him the tit in his deposition. And Dr. Shamos gave a ttal report that "published" does not mean	105	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	back. But I don't want, and I think I've told you this before, but some of the things that have been said recently suggest to me that maybe you-all contemplate a commingling. And I don't want a commingling. That way the Rul3 50 issues are very cleanly and crisply dealt with, the record is as it needs to be, and it will be easier for the jury to understand what happens when I tell them that preponderance of the evidence is how they have to decide infringement.	10
ated disobedience of the Court's directives use I can't conduct a trial being constantly on concern that somebody is trying to come in the door. Now, if I did it wrong, you-all have recourse at in the federal circuit, and that's fine, but I you to understand I don't deal with things that MS. STOLL-DeBELL: I understand, Your Honor, I would like to remind you this came up at the ial conference as well. We have not taken issue the meaning of the term "published." Dr. Weaver said that published means originated, and we d to cross-examine him on that. I asked him tt it in his deposition. And Dr. Shamos gave a		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	this before, but some of the things that have been said recently suggest to me that maybe you-all contemplate a commingling. And I don't want a commingling. That way the Rul3 50 issues are very cleanly and crisply dealt with, the record is as it needs to be, and it will be easier for the jury to understand what happens when I tell them that preponderance of	
use I can't conduct a trial being constantly on concern that somebody is trying to come in the door. Now, if I did it wrong, you-all have recourse at in the federal circuit, and that's fine, but I you to understand I don't deal with things that MS. STOLL-DeBELL: I understand, Your Honor, I would like to remind you this came up at the ial conference as well. We have not taken issue the meaning of the term "published." Dr. Weaver said that published means originated, and we do to cross-examine him on that. I asked him this deposition. And Dr. Shamos gave a		3 4 5 6 7 8 9	said recently suggest to me that maybe you-all contemplate a commingling. And I don't want a commingling. That way the Rul3 50 issues are very cleanly and crisply dealt with, the record is as it needs to be, and it will be easier for the jury to understand what happens when I tell them that preponderance of	
concern that somebody is trying to come in the door. Now, if I did it wrong, you-all have recourse at in the federal circuit, and that's fine, but I you to understand I don't deal with things that MS. STOLL-DeBELL: I understand, Your Honor, I would like to remind you this came up at the ial conference as well. We have not taken issue the meaning of the term "published." Dr. Weaver said that published means originated, and we d to cross-examine him on that. I asked him this deposition. And Dr. Shamos gave a		4 5 6 7 8 9 10	contemplate a commingling. And I don't want a commingling. That way the Rul3 50 issues are very cleanly and crisply dealt with, the record is as it needs to be, and it will be easier for the jury to understand what happens when I tell them that preponderance of	
door. Now, if I did it wrong, you-all have recourse at in the federal circuit, and that's fine, but I you to understand I don't deal with things that MS. STOLL-DeBELL: I understand, Your Honor, I would like to remind you this came up at the ial conference as well. We have not taken issue the meaning of the term "published." Dr. Weaver said that published means originated, and we d to cross-examine him on that. I asked him this deposition. And Dr. Shamos gave a		5 6 7 8 9 10	commingling. That way the Rul3 50 issues are very cleanly and crisply dealt with, the record is as it needs to be, and it will be easier for the jury to understand what happens when I tell them that preponderance of	
Now, if I did it wrong, you-all have recourse at in the federal circuit, and that's fine, but I you to understand I don't deal with things that MS. STOLL-DeBELL: I understand, Your Honor, I would like to remind you this came up at the ial conference as well. We have not taken issue the meaning of the term "published." Dr. Weaver said that published means originated, and we d to cross-examine him on that. I asked him this deposition. And Dr. Shamos gave a		6 7 8 9 10	That way the Rul3 50 issues are very cleanly and crisply dealt with, the record is as it needs to be, and it will be easier for the jury to understand what happens when I tell them that preponderance of	
at in the federal circuit, and that's fine, but I you to understand I don't deal with things that MS. STOLL-DeBELL: I understand, Your Honor, I would like to remind you this came up at the ial conference as well. We have not taken issue the meaning of the term "published." Dr. Weaver said that published means originated, and we d to cross-examine him on that. I asked him tt it in his deposition. And Dr. Shamos gave a		7 8 9 10	and crisply dealt with, the record is as it needs to be, and it will be easier for the jury to understand what happens when I tell them that preponderance of	
you to understand I don't deal with things that MS. STOLL-DeBELL: I understand, Your Honor, I would like to remind you this came up at the ial conference as well. We have not taken issue the meaning of the term "published." Dr. Weaver said that published means originated, and we d to cross-examine him on that. I asked him tt it in his deposition. And Dr. Shamos gave a		8 9 10	be, and it will be easier for the jury to understand what happens when I tell them that preponderance of	
MS. STOLL-DeBELL: I understand, Your Honor, I would like to remind you this came up at the ial conference as well. We have not taken issue the meaning of the term "published." Dr. Weaver said that published means originated, and we d to cross-examine him on that. I asked him this deposition. And Dr. Shamos gave a		8 9 10 11	be, and it will be easier for the jury to understand what happens when I tell them that preponderance of	
MS. STOLL-DeBELL: I understand, Your Honor, I would like to remind you this came up at the ial conference as well. We have not taken issue the meaning of the term "published." Dr. Weaver said that published means originated, and we d to cross-examine him on that. I asked him this deposition. And Dr. Shamos gave a		9 10 11	what happens when I tell them that preponderance of	
MS. STOLL-DeBELL: I understand, Your Honor, I would like to remind you this came up at the ial conference as well. We have not taken issue the meaning of the term "published." Dr. Weaver said that published means originated, and we d to cross-examine him on that. I asked him tt it in his deposition. And Dr. Shamos gave a		10 11		
would like to remind you this came up at the ial conference as well. We have not taken issue the meaning of the term "published." Dr. Weaver said that published means originated, and we d to cross-examine him on that. I asked him tt it in his deposition. And Dr. Shamos gave a		11 .	3	
ial conference as well. We have not taken issue the meaning of the term "published." Dr. Weaver said that published means originated, and we d to cross-examine him on that. I asked him ttit in his deposition. And Dr. Shamos gave a			And clear and convincing evidence is how they have to	
the meaning of the term "published." Dr. Weaver said that published means originated, and we d to cross-examine him on that. I asked him ti ti in his deposition. And Dr. Shamos gave a		12	decide invalidity. All right.	
said that published means originated, and we d to cross-examine him on that. I asked him at it in his deposition. And Dr. Shamos gave a		13	MR. ROBERTSON: Your Honor, may I briefly	
d to cross-examine him on that. I asked him ti ti in his deposition. And Dr. Shamos gave a			address that? I want to make sure I don't run afoul	
at it in his deposition. And Dr. Shamos gave a			of Your Honor's ruling.	
		16	·	
ital report that published does not mean			THE COURT: Why are you dealing with	
			invalidity? Don't you anticipate. You can't	
nated.			anticipate and start trying your response to	
THE COURT: I don't care what the experts			invalidity in the early days of the case because your	
It's what the Court says that's the issue and			foot is then off base. Does that make it clear?	
all didn't call upon me to determine the meaning		21	MR. ROBERTSON: It does, but let me just	
ublished." Now, it's not unheard of that courts		22	raise the context of this, Your Honor. The inventors	
to make claim construction interpretations during		23	are going to come forward and tell how they developed	
rial.		24	their invention. That is the subject matter of these	
I haven't gone back, I think I did this once		25	patents. Part of it is a development of a system that	
	106			10
re, and looked at the ordinary meaning of the word		1	they are also the inventors on, at least two of the	
lished" in the dictionary, and that's what we're		2	three inventors were inventors on, and they are going	
g to use because nobody has taken the view that		3	to say how in part they took that system and made	
lished" means anything other than what it means.		4	changes and modifications to solve problems that are	
MS. STOLL-DeBELL: It is our position it has		5	the subject matter of the patents that have to be	
ordinary meaning, too, Your Honor. To the extent		6	addressed here.	
Dr. Weaver says it doesn't, we intend to		7	THE COURT: Well, that goes to the issue of	
s-examine him on that.		8	whether it's new and useful.	
THE COURT: You sure can.		9	MR. ROBERTSON: Well, it goes to the issue of	
MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Okay.		10	what the inventors actually invented and how they went	
THE COURT: And that's fine.		11	around solving a problem. Solving a problem is really	
Anything else on that point?			what invention is all about. I've never been involved	
MS. STOLL-DeBELL: I don't think so.			in a patent case where the inventors couldn't come	
			·	
			·	
PILE THEODORIDIITY TO DIOVA INTRIDOCOMENT and				
s-examination on infringement is not a time to				
s-examination on infringement is not a time to lop invalidity. I'm not going to hear that that				
s-examination on infringement is not a time to lop invalidity. I'm not going to hear that that I want it all clean, all the evidence cleanly,				
s-examination on infringement is not a time to lop invalidity. I'm not going to hear that that I want it all clean, all the evidence cleanly, ly and organizedly presented on the issue of			put on invalidity evidence.	
s-examination on infringement is not a time to lop invalidity. I'm not going to hear that that I want it all clean, all the evidence cleanly, ly and organizedly presented on the issue of gement.	Į.	23	Now, that's the way cases are tried, patent	
s-examination on infringement is not a time to lop invalidity. I'm not going to hear that that I want it all clean, all the evidence cleanly, ly and organizedly presented on the issue of			·	
s-examination on infringement is not a time to lop invalidity. I'm not going to hear that that I want it all clean, all the evidence cleanly, ly and organizedly presented on the issue of gement.		24	or otherwise. You have the burden, you have an issue,	
r	op invalidity. I'm not going to hear that that I want it all clean, all the evidence cleanly, y and organizedly presented on the issue of	dingly. Now, let's keep in mind the order of things. Plus' responsibility to prove infringement, and -examination on infringement is not a time to op invalidity. I'm not going to hear that that I want it all clean, all the evidence cleanly, y and organizedly presented on the issue of gement.	dingly. Now, let's keep in mind the order of things. 16 Plus' responsibility to prove infringement, and 17 -examination on infringement is not a time to 18 op invalidity. I'm not going to hear that that 19 I want it all clean, all the evidence cleanly, y and organizedly presented on the issue of gement. 22	Mow, let's keep in mind the order of things. 15 THE COURT: Mr. Robertson, I made a clear statement, and you stay within those bounds. And you're smart enough to figure out how to ask those questions that way. If what you're trying to do is somehow use the inventors in anticipation of an invalidity. I'm not going to hear that that 19 somehow use the inventors in anticipation of an invalidity defense, you can't do that. You can bring you and organizedly presented on the issue of 21 them back and you can put on that testimony after he's put on invalidity evidence. If you need to call witnesses back to talk to 23 Now, that's the way cases are tried, patent

2011.01.11 Trial Transcript Day 5 1/11/2011 3:46:00 PM

IN THE LIMITED STATES DISTRICT SOLE	DT 000
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COUR FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGIN	IA
RICHMOND DIVISION	PROCEEDINGS
	2
:	3 THE CLERK: Civil action number 3:09CV00620, ePlus,
ePLUS, INC. : Civil Action No.	4 Incorporated versus Lawson Software, Incorporated. Mr. Scott
: 3:09CV620 vs. :	5 L. Robertson, Mr. Craig T. Merritt, Ms. Jennifer A. Albert, Mr.
:	6 Michael G. Strapp, and Mr. David Young represent the plaintiff.
LAWSON SOFTWARE, INC. : January	7 11, 2011 7 Mr. Daniel W. McDonald, Mr. Dabney J. Carr, IV, Ms.
·	8 Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, and Mr. William D. Schultz represent
	9 the defendant. Are counsel ready to proceed?
COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF THE JURY BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT E.	I 10 MR_ROBERTSON: Plaintiff is Your Honor
BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, AND	
ADDEADANCES	12 THE COURT: What did you all need to talk about?
APPEARANCES:	13 MS. STOLL-DeBELL: We actually resolved it, Your
Scott L. Robertson, Esquire	14 Honor, between the time we that mentioned
Michael G. Strapp, Esquire Jennifer A. Albert, Esquire	15 THE COURT: Tell them to bring the jury in. What do
David M. Young, Esquire	16 we have this morning?
Goodwin Procter, LLP	17 MR. ROBERTSON: The first witness we're calling this
901 New York Avenue NW Suite 900	18 morning is Mr. Keith Lohkamp, Your Honor. He's a Lawson
Washington, D.C. 20001	
Craig T. Merritt, Esquire Christian & Barton, LLP	
909 East Main Street	20 witnesses this morning. I want to make sure my paralegal
Suite 1200	21 oh.
Richmond, Virginia 23219-3095 Counsel for the plaintiff	22
·	23 (Jury in.)
Peppy Peterson, RPR Official Court Reporter	24
United States District Court	25 THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. All
	991
991	993
APPEARANCES: (cont'g)	1 right, we have a witness. Next witness.
Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire	
	2 MR. ROBERTSON: Mr. Keith Lohkamp.
Troutman Sanders, LLP	·
Troutman Sanders Building	3 THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp.
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point	3 THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. 4
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219	3 THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. 4 5 KEITH LOHKAMP,
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point	3 THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. 4 5 KEITH LOHKAMP, 6 a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTSON:
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q Good morning, Mr. Lohkamp.
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q Good morning, Mr. Lohkamp. A Good morning.
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q Good morning, Mr. Lohkamp.
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q Good morning, Mr. Lohkamp. A Good morning.
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q Good morning, Mr. Lohkamp. A Good morning. Q Mr. Lohkamp, you are a Lawson Software employee; correct?
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q Good morning, Mr. Lohkamp. A Good morning. Q Mr. Lohkamp, you are a Lawson Software employee; correct? A Yes, I am.
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q Good morning, Mr. Lohkamp. A Good morning. Q Mr. Lohkamp, you are a Lawson Software employee; correct? A Yes, I am. A And you are a product strategist for supply chain
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q Good morning, Mr. Lohkamp. A Good morning. Q Mr. Lohkamp, you are a Lawson Software employee; correct? A Yes, I am. A Yes, I am. A And you are a product strategist for supply chain management; correct?
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q Good morning, Mr. Lohkamp. A Good morning. Q Mr. Lohkamp, you are a Lawson Software employee; correct? A Yes, I am. Q And you are a product strategist for supply chain management; correct? A Yes.
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q Good morning, Mr. Lohkamp. A Good morning. Q Mr. Lohkamp, you are a Lawson Software employee; correct? A Yes, I am. Q And you are a product strategist for supply chain management; correct? A Yes. THE COURT: Can we get the witness to spell his last.
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q Good morning, Mr. Lohkamp. A Good morning. Q Mr. Lohkamp, you are a Lawson Software employee; correct? A Yes, I am. Q And you are a product strategist for supply chain management; correct? A Yes. THE COURT: Can we get the witness to spell his last. Q Can you please spell your last name, sir, for the record.
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q Good morning, Mr. Lohkamp. A Good morning. Q Mr. Lohkamp, you are a Lawson Software employee; correct? A Yes, I am. Q And you are a product strategist for supply chain management; correct? A Yes. THE COURT: Can we get the witness to spell his last. Q Can you please spell your last name, sir, for the record. A It's L-o-h-k-a-m-p. Q Can you explain to the jury essentially what supply chain
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q Good morning, Mr. Lohkamp. A Good morning. Q Mr. Lohkamp, you are a Lawson Software employee; correct? A Yes, I am. A Yes, I am. A Yes. THE COURT: Can we get the witness to spell his last. C Can you please spell your last name, sir, for the record. A It's L-o-h-k-a-m-p. C Can you explain to the jury essentially what supply chain management is?
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q Good morning, Mr. Lohkamp. A Good morning. Q Mr. Lohkamp, you are a Lawson Software employee; correct? A Yes, I am. Q And you are a product strategist for supply chain management; correct? A Yes. THE COURT: Can we get the witness to spell his last. Q Can you please spell your last name, sir, for the record. It's L-o-h-k-a-m-p. Q Can you explain to the jury essentially what supply chain management is? A Supply chain management involves the procurement of goods
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q Good morning, Mr. Lohkamp. A Good morning. Q Mr. Lohkamp, you are a Lawson Software employee; correct? A Yes, I am. Q And you are a product strategist for supply chain management; correct? A Yes. THE COURT: Can we get the witness to spell his last. Q Can you please spell your last name, sir, for the record. A It's L-o-h-k-a-m-p. C Can you explain to the jury essentially what supply chain management is? A Supply chain management involves the procurement of goods and services and the management of the inventory related to
Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402	THE COURT: All right, Keith Lohkamp. KEITH LOHKAMP, a witness, called by the plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q Good morning, Mr. Lohkamp. A Good morning. Q Mr. Lohkamp, you are a Lawson Software employee; correct? A Yes, I am. Q And you are a product strategist for supply chain management; correct? A Yes. THE COURT: Can we get the witness to spell his last. Q Can you please spell your last name, sir, for the record. It's L-o-h-k-a-m-p. Q Can you explain to the jury essentially what supply chain management is? A Supply chain management involves the procurement of goods

2011.01.11 Trial Transcript Day 5 1/11/2011 3:46:00 PM

		1082			10
1	And this questioning goes to directly to	1	В	Y MS. STOLL-DeBELL:	
2	that. Where did this information originate? The	2	: C	You probably need me to ask my question again?	
3	organized collection. Who created that?	3	A	Yes, please.	
1	MR. ROBERTSON: There's no "who created it"	4	C	I'll do the best I can.	
5	in your construction, Your Honor.	5	;	Who selects the items that are included in item	
6	THE COURT: I don't understand where the	6	m	naster?	
7	"who" is unless you're trying to establish that	7		MR. ROBERTSON: Can I have a running	
3	"published by a vendor" means selecting something to	8	0	bjection to this line of questioning because I just	
9	put in the item master. Is that what you're trying to	9	d	on't want to keep interrupting?	
0	show?	10	0	THE COURT: It's the same one I just	
1	MS. STOLL-DeBELL: I'm trying to show that	1	1 o	verruled. So you obviously have that. She's just	
2	Lawson's item master is not published by a vendor.	1:	2 re	epeating the question that she had. Go ahead.	
3	The organized collection of items is something that is	1:		And running objections to questions are not	
4	created by Lawson's customer, not by a vendor. So	14	4 a	ood things because nobody knows where the running	
5	it's selected, it's organized, all of that stuff is	1	·	tops. So if you have an objection to a question, you	
6	done by the customer not a vendor.	10		ave to raise it, but on this one, you've already	
7	And, therefore, and for other reasons as	1		aised it.	
8	well, it's not published by a vendor. It's	11		So who in your understanding selects the	
9		19		ems to be put in the item master?	
	something THE COURT: You're offering this evidence to	20			
0	•			THE WITNESS: The customer selects the items	
11	support your view that placement of items in the item	2		b be put in the item master.	
2	master is not a catalog; is that right? Because the	22		Why doesn't Lawson select the items that go into	
:3	items in the catalog are not published by a vendor; is	23		ne item master?	
24 25	that right? MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Yes, and the item master	24		 Because we don't know what our customers purchase, nd we don't have visibility into the items they have 	
		1083			10
1	itself is not published by a vendor.	1		n contract or want to purchase.	
2	THE COURT: And that's basically your defense	2	: C	What's the purpose of item master?	
3	in this case, isn't it?	3			
			. A	The purpose of the item master is to create a list	
4	MS. STOLL-DeBELL: It's one of them.	4		The purpose of the item master is to create a list goods and services that our customers are typically	
4 5	MS. STOLL-DeBELL: It's one of them. THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one,	4	0		
			o j g	f goods and services that our customers are typically	
5	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one,	5	o j g	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory.	
5 6 7	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one, isn't it.	5	o g i A	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory. Ind so the goal is to be able to make that list	
5	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one, isn't it. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: The principal one in that	5 6 7	o g G A a	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory. and so the goal is to be able to make that list vailable to their employees.	
5 6 7 8	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one, isn't it. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: The principal one in that item master is not a catalog published by a vendor,	5 6 7 8	o g A A C e	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory. und so the goal is to be able to make that list vailable to their employees. Is it possible for a customer to decide to include	
5 7 3	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one, isn't it. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: The principal one in that item master is not a catalog published by a vendor, yes.	5 6 7 8 9	o g G A G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory. Ind so the goal is to be able to make that list vailable to their employees. It is it possible for a customer to decide to include very item a vendor sells in the item master?	
5 6 7 3 9	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one, isn't it. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: The principal one in that item master is not a catalog published by a vendor, yes. THE COURT: The principal defense to the	5 6 7 8 9	o g g a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory. and so the goal is to be able to make that list vailable to their employees. a Is it possible for a customer to decide to include very item a vendor sells in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection. It calls for	
5 7 3 9	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one, isn't it. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: The principal one in that item master is not a catalog published by a vendor, yes. THE COURT: The principal defense to the issue of catalog, isn't it?	5 6 7 8 9 11	o g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory. and so the goal is to be able to make that list vailable to their employees. It is it possible for a customer to decide to include very item a vendor sells in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection. It calls for peculation, Your Honor.	
5 7 3 9 0 1	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one, isn't it. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: The principal one in that item master is not a catalog published by a vendor, yes. THE COURT: The principal defense to the issue of catalog, isn't it? MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Yes.	5 6 7 8 9 10 1:	o g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory. Ind so the goal is to be able to make that list vailable to their employees. It is it possible for a customer to decide to include very item a vendor sells in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection. It calls for peculation, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, if he knows.	
5 6 7 3 9 0 1 2 3 4	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one, isn't it. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: The principal one in that item master is not a catalog published by a vendor, yes. THE COURT: The principal defense to the issue of catalog, isn't it? MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Yes. THE COURT: Objection overruled, but the jury	5 6 7 8 9 11 1: 1:	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory. Ind so the goal is to be able to make that list vailable to their employees. It is it possible for a customer to decide to include very item a vendor sells in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection. It calls for peculation, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, if he knows. Do you know that?	
5 7 3 9 0 1 2 3 4 5	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one, isn't it. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: The principal one in that item master is not a catalog published by a vendor, yes. THE COURT: The principal defense to the issue of catalog, isn't it? MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Yes. THE COURT: Objection overruled, but the jury can make its decision on the fact whether it's	5 6 7 8 9 11 1: 1:	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory. and so the goal is to be able to make that list vailable to their employees. a Is it possible for a customer to decide to include very item a vendor sells in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection. It calls for peculation, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, if he knows. Do you know that? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do know that.	
5 6 7 3 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one, isn't it. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: The principal one in that item master is not a catalog published by a vendor, yes. THE COURT: The principal defense to the issue of catalog, isn't it? MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Yes. THE COURT: Objection overruled, but the jury can make its decision on the fact whether it's admitted only to do — not for the definition of	5 6 7 8 9 1(1: 1:	9 9 A A C P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory. and so the goal is to be able to make that list vailable to their employees. It is it possible for a customer to decide to include very item a vendor sells in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection. It calls for peculation, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, if he knows. Do you know that? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do know that. THE COURT: All right.	
5 6 7 3 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one, isn't it. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: The principal one in that item master is not a catalog published by a vendor, yes. THE COURT: The principal defense to the issue of catalog, isn't it? MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Yes. THE COURT: Objection overruled, but the jury can make its decision on the fact whether it's admitted only to do — not for the definition of "catalog," but having to do with published by a	5 6 7 8 9 10 1: 1: 1: 1:	6	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory. and so the goal is to be able to make that list vailable to their employees. It is it possible for a customer to decide to include very item a vendor sells in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection. It calls for peculation, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, if he knows. Do you know that? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do know that. THE COURT: All right. It is possible, but our customers typically	
5 6 7 3 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one, isn't it. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: The principal one in that item master is not a catalog published by a vendor, yes. THE COURT: The principal defense to the issue of catalog, isn't it? MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Yes. THE COURT: Objection overruled, but the jury can make its decision on the fact whether it's admitted only to do not for the definition of "catalog," but having to do with published by a vendor. And those are issues that you'll have to	5 6 7 8 9 10 1: 1: 1: 1: 1:	6 G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory. Indicate the goal is to be able to make that list vailable to their employees. It is it possible for a customer to decide to include very item a vendor sells in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection. It calls for peculation, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, if he knows. Do you know that? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do know that. THE COURT: All right. It is possible, but our customers typically THE COURT: All she asked is: Is it	
5 6 7 3 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one, isn't it. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: The principal one in that item master is not a catalog published by a vendor, yes. THE COURT: The principal defense to the issue of catalog, isn't it? MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Yes. THE COURT: Objection overruled, but the jury can make its decision on the fact whether it's admitted only to do — not for the definition of "catalog," but having to do with published by a vendor. And those are issues that you'll have to argue based on the testimony and the record.	5 6 7 8 9 11 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1:	0 9 9 A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory. Ind so the goal is to be able to make that list vailable to their employees. It is it possible for a customer to decide to include very item a vendor sells in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection. It calls for peculation, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, if he knows. Do you know that? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do know that. THE COURT: All right. It is possible, but our customers typically THE COURT: All she asked is: Is it ossible?	
5 6 7 3 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one, isn't it. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: The principal one in that item master is not a catalog published by a vendor, yes. THE COURT: The principal defense to the issue of catalog, isn't it? MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Yes. THE COURT: Objection overruled, but the jury can make its decision on the fact whether it's admitted only to do — not for the definition of "catalog," but having to do with published by a vendor. And those are issues that you'll have to argue based on the testimony and the record. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Thank you.	5 6 7 8 9 11 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1:	o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory. Ind so the goal is to be able to make that list vailable to their employees. It is it possible for a customer to decide to include very item a vendor sells in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection. It calls for peculation, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, if he knows. Do you know that? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do know that. THE COURT: All right. It is possible, but our customers typically THE COURT: All she asked is: Is it ossible? Yes, it's possible.	
5 7 3 9 0 1 2	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one, isn't it. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: The principal one in that item master is not a catalog published by a vendor, yes. THE COURT: The principal defense to the issue of catalog, isn't it? MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Yes. THE COURT: Objection overruled, but the jury can make its decision on the fact whether it's admitted only to do — not for the definition of "catalog," but having to do with published by a vendor. And those are issues that you'll have to argue based on the testimony and the record. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Thank you. THE COURT: That's all it's admitted for,	5 6 7 8 9 10 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 2:	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory. Ind so the goal is to be able to make that list vailable to their employees. It is to possible for a customer to decide to include very item a vendor sells in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection. It calls for peculation, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, if he knows. Do you know that? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do know that. THE COURT: All right. It is possible, but our customers typically THE COURT: All she asked is: Is it ossible? Yes, it's possible.	
5 6 7 3 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one, isn't it. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: The principal one in that item master is not a catalog published by a vendor, yes. THE COURT: The principal defense to the issue of catalog, isn't it? MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Yes. THE COURT: Objection overruled, but the jury can make its decision on the fact whether it's admitted only to do not for the definition of "catalog," but having to do with published by a vendor. And those are issues that you'll have to argue based on the testimony and the record. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Thank you. THE COURT: That's all it's admitted for, ladies and gentlemen. Who puts it in the catalog doesn't change the	5 6 7 8 9 10 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 2: 2:	6 9 9 A C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory. Ind so the goal is to be able to make that list vailable to their employees. It is it possible for a customer to decide to include very item a vendor sells in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection. It calls for peculation, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, if he knows. Do you know that? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do know that. THE COURT: All right. It is possible, but our customers typically THE COURT: All she asked is: Is it ossible? Yes, it's possible. Have you ever seen one of your customers or are ou aware of a situation where one of your customers	
5 6 7 3 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2	THE COURT: Well, it's the principal one, isn't it. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: The principal one in that item master is not a catalog published by a vendor, yes. THE COURT: The principal defense to the issue of catalog, isn't it? MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Yes. THE COURT: Objection overruled, but the jury can make its decision on the fact whether it's admitted only to do — not for the definition of "catalog," but having to do with published by a vendor. And those are issues that you'll have to argue based on the testimony and the record. MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Thank you. THE COURT: That's all it's admitted for, ladies and gentlemen.	5 6 7 8 9 10 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 2: 2: 2:	6 9 9 A C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	f goods and services that our customers are typically oing to want to purchase or maintain in inventory. Indicate the goal is to be able to make that list vailable to their employees. It is it possible for a customer to decide to include very item a vendor sells in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection. It calls for peculation, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, if he knows. Do you know that? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do know that. THE COURT: All right. It is possible, but our customers typically THE COURT: All she asked is: Is it ossible? Yes, it's possible. Have you ever seen one of your customers or are ou aware of a situation where one of your customers ecided to include every single item a vendor sells in	

	1490
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA	1492
RICHMOND DIVISION	1 PROCEEDINGS
	2
:	3 THE CLERK: Civil action number 3:09CV620, ePlus,
ePLUS, INC. : Civil Action No.	4 Incorporated, versus Lawson Software, Incorporated. Mr. Scott
: 3:09CV620 vs. :	5 L. Robertson, Mr. Craig T. Merritt, Ms. Jennifer A. Albert, and
vs. :	6 Mr. Michael G. Strapp represent the plaintiff.
LAWSON SOFTWARE, INC. : January 13, 2011	7 Mr. Daniel W. McDonald, Mr. Dabney J. Carr, IV, Ms.
:	8 Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, and Mr. William D. Schultz represent
	9 the defendant. Are counsel ready to proceed?
COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF THE JURY TRIAL BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. PAYNE	10 MR. ROBERTSON: Plaintiff is, Your Honor. Thank you.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, AND A JURY	11 MR. McDONALD: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
ADDEADANCES.	12 THE COURT: Do you need to see me about something
APPEARANCES:	13 before the jury comes in?
Scott L. Robertson, Esquire	14 MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, Your Honor. You had asked us to
Michael G. Strapp, Esquire Jennifer A. Albert, Esquire	15 take a look at those appendices with respect to our motion on
David M. Young, Esquire	16 this implementation on a customer-by-customer basis.
Goodwin Procter, LLP 901 New York Avenue NW	17 THE COURT: Yeah.
Suite 900	18 MR. ROBERTSON: We have done that, and the reason I
Washington, D.C. 20001	19 raised it, Your Honor, is one of the witnesses that's going to
Craig T. Merritt, Esquire Christian & Barton, LLP	20 be called this morning is Ms. Hannah Raleigh. You may recall
909 East Main Street	21 she testified once already. She is involved with Lawson
Suite 1200 Richmond, Virginia 23219-3095	22 Professional Services that has to do that has responsibility
Counsel for the plaintiff	23 for implementation of the Lawson software products, and we're
Peppy Peterson, RPR	24 concerned that she's going to be getting into areas in and
Official Court Reporter	
United States District Court	25 presenting testimony that Lawson is going to contend are
	1491
1491	1493
APPEARANCES: (cont'g) Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire	1 defenses to infringement later that are directly implicated by
Troutman Sanders, LLP	2 that interrogatory number 24.
Troutman Sanders Building	3 What I have provided Your Honor with is the
1001 Haxall Point	4 appendices that were referenced in the answers to the
Richmond, Virginia 23219	5 interrogatories, the transcript from the March 26th hearing,
Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire	6 telephonic hearing on the motion to compel, and the relevant
Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire	7 citations to the transcript where this issue came up, and I do
Merchant & Gould, PC	8 want to continue to press the motion, Your Honor.
80 South Eighth Street	9 We do think that the answers, even with the
Suite 3200	10 appendices, were nowhere near what was called for and what Your
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402	11 Honor directed Lawson to do in response to that.
	12 If I might just, Your Honor, you may recall that
	13 these appendices that are being referenced were provided to
	14 ePlus three months before the motion to compel was presented,
	15 and the appendices do not respond to the interrogatory as
	16 represented by counsel for Lawson.
	17 Indeed, if you look at some of the appendices, for
	18 example
	19 THE COURT: Is A appendix A?
	· · ·
	20 MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, sir. Under the tab December 23,
	20 MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, sir. Under the tab December 23, 21 2009, response to interrogatory number yeah, A is one.
	20 MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, sir. Under the tab December 23, 21 2009, response to interrogatory number yeah, A is one. 22 THE COURT: March 26th is the first tab, the
	20 MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, sir. Under the tab December 23, 21 2009, response to interrogatory number yeah, A is one. 22 THE COURT: March 26th is the first tab, the 23 transcript, and then there's an A behind that. Is that
	20 MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, sir. Under the tab December 23, 21 2009, response to interrogatory number yeah, A is one. 22 THE COURT: March 26th is the first tab, the

			1		
		1590			15
1	Q Does that refresh your recollection that this new		1	A That's correct.	
2	functionality was added with respect to 8.0.3 when		2	Q And you would agree with me that that item catalog	
3	this release note came out?		3	information disclosed by the vendor or the supplier	
4	A This reflects it does help refresh my memory		4	through a vendor agreement import process ends up in	
5	about these particular release notes, yes.		5	the item master, correct?	
6	THE COURT: That wasn't the question. The		6	A Say that again.	
7	question was: Does it refresh your recollection that		7	Q Yes. The vendor or the supplier who provides this	
8	the new functionality has been added to electronically		8	item catalog information to the customer can be	
9	load a vendor file which contains vendor item, unit of		9	imported through this process we're talking about	
10	measure, and unit of price information into the		10	here, this vendor agreement import, into the item	
11	purchase order application? Does it refresh your		11	master?	
12	recollection on that point?		12	MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Objection to form of the	
13	THE WITNESS: Yes, it does.		13	question. It's unclear.	
14	THE COURT: All right. And did it?		14	MR. ROBERTSON: I'll rephrase, Your Honor.	
15	THE WITNESS: Did it do what?		15	THE COURT: All right.	
16	THE COURT: Did it do what it said in that		16	MS. STOLL-DeBELL: I think he talked about a	
17	first sentence that you've been talking about?		17	supplier being loaded in.	
18	THE WITNESS: Yes, it did, Your Honor.		18	MR. ROBERTSON: I'll rephrase the question.	
19	THE COURT: All right. Let's go.		19	BY MR. ROBERTSON:	
20	BY MR. ROBERTSON:		20	Q The vendor that has provided the catalog item	
21	Q The next bullet point says, Item 3 identifies how		21	information in a CSV format ends up through this	
22	a Lawson item number should be created when adding the		22	process in the item master; isn't that right?	
23	catalog item to the item master. Do you see that?		23	MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Objection. The vendor	
24	A Yes.		24	the question is unclear.	
25	Q Those are the terms you used, the catalog item,	1591	25	THE COURT: Are you asking whether the vendor	15
25		1591			18
	Q Those are the terms you used, the catalog item, isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3?	1591	25 1 2	THE COURT: Are you asking whether the vendor ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No.	18
25	isn't that right, when you made this new release note	1591	1	ends up in the item master?	11
25 1 2	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3?	1591	1 2	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No.	11
25 1 2 3	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical	1591	1 2 3	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and	1:
1 2 3 4	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer.	1591	1 2 3 4	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken.	1:
1 2 3 4 5	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are	1591	1 2 3 4 5	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then.	1:
25 1 2 3 4 5 6	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are you, sir?	1591	1 2 3 4 5 6	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then. THE COURT: It's the item that ends up there,	1:
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are you, sir? A No. You did ask me "did you use that term," and I	1591	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then. THE COURT: It's the item that ends up there, I think.	19
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are you, sir? A No. You did ask me "did you use that term," and I did not use that term.	1591	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then. THE COURT: It's the item that ends up there, I think. BY MR. ROBERTSON:	1:
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are you, sir? A No. You did ask me "did you use that term," and I did not use that term. Q I'm sorry. It was an indefinite pronoun. Did	1591	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then. THE COURT: It's the item that ends up there, I think. BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q The vendor provides the item catalog information	1:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are you, sir? A No. You did ask me "did you use that term," and I did not use that term. Q I'm sorry. It was an indefinite pronoun. Did Lawson use "catalog item" when it did these release	1591	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then. THE COURT: It's the item that ends up there, I think. BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q. The vendor provides the item catalog information that ends up in the item master; isn't that right?	1
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 111	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are you, sir? A No. You did ask me "did you use that term," and I did not use that term. Q I'm sorry. It was an indefinite pronoun. Did Lawson use "catalog item" when it did these release notes?	1591	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then. THE COURT: It's the item that ends up there, I think. BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q The vendor provides the item catalog information that ends up in the item master; isn't that right? A That is some of the information that ends up	1
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are you, sir? A No. You did ask me "did you use that term," and I did not use that term. Q I'm sorry. It was an indefinite pronoun. Did Lawson use "catalog item" when it did these release notes? A Yes, it did.	1591	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then. THE COURT: It's the item that ends up there, I think. BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q The vendor provides the item catalog information that ends up in the item master; isn't that right? A That is some of the information that ends up there.	1
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are you, sir? A No. You did ask me "did you use that term," and I did not use that term. Q I'm sorry. It was an indefinite pronoun. Did Lawson use "catalog item" when it did these release notes? A Yes, it did. Q On this import process?	1591	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then. THE COURT: It's the item that ends up there, I think. BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q. The vendor provides the item catalog information that ends up in the item master; isn't that right? A. That is some of the information that ends up there. Q. Why don't you take a look at this vendor import	1:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are you, sir? A No. You did ask me "did you use that term," and I did not use that term. Q I'm sorry. It was an indefinite pronoun. Did Lawson use "catalog item" when it did these release notes? A Yes, it did. Q On this import process? A Yes.	1591	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then. THE COURT: It's the item that ends up there, I think. BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q The vendor provides the item catalog information that ends up in the item master; isn't that right? A That is some of the information that ends up there. Q Why don't you take a look at this vendor import price agreement again. Let me see if I can refresh	1
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are you, sir? A No. You did ask me "did you use that term," and I did not use that term. Q I'm sorry. It was an indefinite pronoun. Did Lawson use "catalog item" when it did these release notes? A Yes, it did. Q On this import process? A Yes. Q It's the vendor that are provides the item catalog	1591	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then. THE COURT: It's the item that ends up there, I think. BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q The vendor provides the item catalog information that ends up in the item master; isn't that right? A That is some of the information that ends up there. Q Why don't you take a look at this vendor import price agreement again. Let me see if I can refresh your recollection on the process. If you would look	1:
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are you, sir? A No. You did ask me "did you use that term," and I did not use that term. Q I'm sorry. It was an indefinite pronoun. Did Lawson use "catalog item" when it did these release notes? A Yes, it did. Q On this import process? A Yes. Q It's the vendor that are provides the item catalog in a CSV format; is that right?	1591	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then. THE COURT: It's the item that ends up there, I think. BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q The vendor provides the item catalog information that ends up in the item master; isn't that right? A That is some of the information that ends up there. Q Why don't you take a look at this vendor import price agreement again. Let me see if I can refresh your recollection on the process. If you would look at the page that ends 428.	1:
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are you, sir? A No. You did ask me "did you use that term," and I did not use that term. Q I'm sorry. It was an indefinite pronoun. Did Lawson use "catalog item" when it did these release notes? A Yes, it did. Q On this import process? A Yes. Q It's the vendor that are provides the item catalog in a CSV format; is that right? A That's correct.	1591	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then. THE COURT: It's the item that ends up there, I think. BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q The vendor provides the item catalog information that ends up in the item master; isn't that right? A That is some of the information that ends up there. Q Why don't you take a look at this vendor import price agreement again. Let me see if I can refresh your recollection on the process. If you would look at the page that ends 428. A Sorry about that. I was in the wrong document.	1:
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are you, sir? A No. You did ask me "did you use that term," and I did not use that term. Q I'm sorry. It was an indefinite pronoun. Did Lawson use "catalog item" when it did these release notes? A Yes, it did. Q On this import process? A Yes. Q It's the vendor that are provides the item catalog in a CSV format; is that right? A That's correct. Q The vendor discloses or makes known that item	1591	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then. THE COURT: It's the item that ends up there, I think. BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q The vendor provides the item catalog information that ends up in the item master; isn't that right? A That is some of the information that ends up there. Q Why don't you take a look at this vendor import price agreement again. Let me see if I can refresh your recollection on the process. If you would look at the page that ends 428. A Sorry about that. I was in the wrong document. Q That's all right. Take your time. Do you see	1:
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are you, sir? A No. You did ask me "did you use that term," and I did not use that term. Q I'm sorry. It was an indefinite pronoun. Did Lawson use "catalog item" when it did these release notes? A Yes, it did. Q On this import process? A Yes. Q It's the vendor that are provides the item catalog in a CSV format; is that right? A That's correct. Q The vendor discloses or makes known that item information in that CSV format, correct?	1591	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then. THE COURT: It's the item that ends up there, I think. BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q The vendor provides the item catalog information that ends up in the item master; isn't that right? A That is some of the information that ends up there. Q Why don't you take a look at this vendor import price agreement again. Let me see if I can refresh your recollection on the process. If you would look at the page that ends 428. A Sorry about that. I was in the wrong document. Q That's all right. Take your time. Do you see that page is entitled, Vendor agreement import?	1
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are you, sir? A No. You did ask me "did you use that term," and I did not use that term. Q I'm sorry. It was an indefinite pronoun. Did Lawson use "catalog item" when it did these release notes? A Yes, it did. Q On this import process? A Yes. Q It's the vendor that are provides the item catalog in a CSV format; is that right? A That's correct. Q The vendor discloses or makes known that item information in that CSV format, correct? A Discloses to whom?	1591	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then. THE COURT: It's the item that ends up there, I think. BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q The vendor provides the item catalog information that ends up in the item master; isn't that right? A That is some of the information that ends up there. Q Why don't you take a look at this vendor import price agreement again. Let me see if I can refresh your recollection on the process. If you would look at the page that ends 428. A Sorry about that. I was in the wrong document. Q That's all right. Take your time. Do you see that page is entitled, Vendor agreement import? A That's correct.	1:
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are you, sir? A No. You did ask me "did you use that term," and I did not use that term. Q I'm sorry. It was an indefinite pronoun. Did Lawson use "catalog item" when it did these release notes? A Yes, it did. Q On this import process? A Yes. Q It's the vendor that are provides the item catalog in a CSV format; is that right? A That's correct. Q The vendor discloses or makes known that item information in that CSV format, correct? A Discloses to whom? Q The customer. A To the customer, yes.	1591	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then. THE COURT: It's the item that ends up there, I think. BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q The vendor provides the item catalog information that ends up in the item master; isn't that right? A That is some of the information that ends up there. Q Why don't you take a look at this vendor import price agreement again. Let me see if I can refresh your recollection on the process. If you would look at the page that ends 428. A Sorry about that. I was in the wrong document. Q That's all right. Take your time. Do you see that page is entitled, Vendor agreement import? A That's correct. Q And in the first box, it says, Vendor provides	1:
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	isn't that right, when you made this new release note for Version 8.0.3? A That's a term that was used by the technical writer. Q You're not trying to run away from "catalog," are you, sir? A No. You did ask me "did you use that term," and I did not use that term. Q I'm sorry. It was an indefinite pronoun. Did Lawson use "catalog item" when it did these release notes? A Yes, it did. Q On this import process? A Yes. Q It's the vendor that are provides the item catalog in a CSV format; is that right? A That's correct. Q The vendor discloses or makes known that item information in that CSV format, correct? A Discloses to whom? Q The customer.	1591	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ends up in the item master? MR. ROBERTSON: No. THE COURT: That's what her objection is and I think it's well taken. MR. ROBERTSON: Let me rephrase then. THE COURT: It's the item that ends up there, I think. BY MR. ROBERTSON: Q The vendor provides the item catalog information that ends up in the item master; isn't that right? A That is some of the information that ends up there. Q Why don't you take a look at this vendor import price agreement again. Let me see if I can refresh your recollection on the process. If you would look at the page that ends 428. A Sorry about that. I was in the wrong document. Q That's all right. Take your time. Do you see that page is entitled, Vendor agreement import? A That's correct. Q And in the first box, it says, Vendor provides item catalog in CSV format. Do you see that?	1:

			13 Trial Transcript Day 7 1/13/2011 3:01:00 PI
	17	746	1748
1 Honor, to	generally how it describes. In fact,	1	A Because 11 of those 12 claims require two or more
2 there's a	slide here that I was anticipating Mr.	2	catalogs and unless you have two or more catalogs, you
3 McDonal	ld bringing up and we have an objection to	3	can't infringe those claims.
4 because	we think it pertains to getting legal	4	Q Do you know whether or not Dr. Weaver agrees with
5 opinions.	. That has been ruled out of the case. Also	5	you that that infringement would turn on whether or
6 to attemp	oting to recharacterize or reargue the Markman	6	not 11 of those 12 claims have multiple catalogs?
7 ruling, in	which the Court has given a construction.	7	A Well, my recollection from his report is his
8 So	how they generally describe it doesn't	8	opinion is that they do have catalogs.
9 really ma	atter, Your Honor, and it's going to be a	9	Q Do you understand he would agree with the
10 reference	e here to the prosecution of the patents.	10	principal, though, that if the Lawson systems did not
11 MR	R. McDONALD: Your Honor, I don't have any	11	have multiple catalogs, 11 of the 12 claims would not
12 slides up	there. I'm trying to avoid the issues that	12	be infringed?
13 they raise	ed with us at least to get through this	13	A He should agree with it. I don't know.
14 afternoor	n on that. I'm not talking about the file	14	MR. ROBERTSON: Objection.
15 history a	t this point.	15	THE COURT: Sustained.
16 I'm	asking about after reading the patents,	16	BY MR. McDONALD:
17 generally	what's the invention, which I think is very	17	Q Why don't we go to slide No. 8, please.
18 helpful to	the jury's understanding of a complex case.	18	Do you see up on the screen, Dr. Shamos, this is
19 MR	R. ROBERTSON: The claims define the	19	another slide that you prepared, correct?
20 invention	, Your Honor. It's the claims that the jury	20	A Yes.
21 is going t	to have to look at, not some characterization	21	Q Well, what are you depicting here in this slide?
22 of what g	generally the invention is.	22	A I'm just reiterating the Court's literally the
23 TH	E COURT: I think Mr. Robertson is right.	23	Court's construction of the term "catalog."
24 Sustaine	d.	24	Q How did you use this Court construction of the
25 BY MR. I	McDONALD:	25	term "catalog" in your an analysis?
		47	1748
1 Q Can	you tell me	1	A Well, I looked at item master and I tried to
2 MR	R. McDONALD: Can we go to slide No. 6,	2	determine whether item master satisfied the Court's
3 please?	Put that up.	3	construction. And I concluded that it didn't. And so
4 Q Dr. S	hamos, you put this slide together as well,	4	therefore it doesn't have a catalog.
5 correct?		5	Q So when doing that analysis, did you use the Court
6 A Yes.		6	construction as set forth here on this slide?
7 Q Does	this slide up on the screen right now, is	7	A It's a basic prerequisite of the analysis.
8 this displ	aying your No. 1 reason for non-infringement	8	Q If we could go to the next slide that you put
9 in this ca		9	together, please. I think this one is not objected
10 A It is.	There are many reasons. There are two	10	
	that I think cover a huge fraction of the	11	So here in this next slide, No. 9, Dr. Shamos, can
	and we'll go through those two first, and then	12	
ız udillis. d	ina wo ii go anoagir alooc two liiot, ana alon	12	you summarize your reasons why the Lawson system does
	when we get into the individual claims, I'll	13	you summarize your reasons why the Lawson system does not have a catalog?
13 later on v	when we get into the individual claims, I'll		not have a catalog?
13 later on v14 be able t	when we get into the individual claims, I'll o give the other reasons.	13	not have a catalog? A Yes. Right now we're
13 later on v14 be able t15 Q So w	when we get into the individual claims, I'll o give the other reasons. hat's reason No. 1 of your reasons for	13 14	not have a catalog? A Yes. Right now we're Q I'll walk you through this step by step here and
13 later on v14 be able t15 Q So w16 non-infrir	when we get into the individual claims, I'll o give the other reasons.	13 14 15	not have a catalog? A Yes. Right now we're Q I'll walk you through this step by step here and
 13 later on v 14 be able t 15 Q So w 16 non-infrir 17 A Well, 	when we get into the individual claims, I'll o give the other reasons. hat's reason No. 1 of your reasons for negement? reason No. 1 is 11 out of the 12 claims	13 14 15 16	not have a catalog? A Yes. Right now we're Q I'll walk you through this step by step here and we'll stick with the question and answer format. A Yes.
13 later on v 14 be able t 15 Q So w 16 non-infrir 17 A Well, 18 require a	when we get into the individual claims, I'll o give the other reasons. hat's reason No. 1 of your reasons for ngement? reason No. 1 is 11 out of the 12 claims a catalog or catalogs. And because Lawson's	13 14 15 16 17	not have a catalog? A Yes. Right now we're Q I'll walk you through this step by step here and we'll stick with the question and answer format. A Yes. Q I'll start by saying can you give me a summary of
13 later on v 14 be able t 15 Q So w 16 non-infrir 17 A Well, 18 require a 19 products	when we get into the individual claims, I'll o give the other reasons. hat's reason No. 1 of your reasons for ngement? reason No. 1 is 11 out of the 12 claims o catalog or catalogs. And because Lawson's don't have a catalog, they can't satisfy the	13 14 15 16 17 18	not have a catalog? A Yes. Right now we're Q I'll walk you through this step by step here and we'll stick with the question and answer format. A Yes. Q I'll start by saying can you give me a summary of why in your opinion the Lawson systems do not have a
13 later on v 14 be able t 15 Q So w 16 non-infrir 17 A Well, 18 require a 19 products 20 requirem	when we get into the individual claims, I'll o give the other reasons. hat's reason No. 1 of your reasons for negement? reason No. 1 is 11 out of the 12 claims a catalog or catalogs. And because Lawson's don't have a catalog, they can't satisfy the sents of at least 11 of the 12 claims.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	not have a catalog? A Yes. Right now we're Q I'll walk you through this step by step here and we'll stick with the question and answer format. A Yes. Q I'll start by saying can you give me a summary of why in your opinion the Lawson systems do not have a catalog as the Court has defined that term?
13 later on v 14 be able t 15 Q So w 16 non-infrir 17 A Well, 18 require a 19 products 20 requirem 21 Q Why	when we get into the individual claims, I'll o give the other reasons. hat's reason No. 1 of your reasons for agement? reason No. 1 is 11 out of the 12 claims a catalog or catalogs. And because Lawson's don't have a catalog, they can't satisfy the sents of at least 11 of the 12 claims. in your opinion do 11 of the 12 claims I'll	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	not have a catalog? A Yes. Right now we're Q I'll walk you through this step by step here and we'll stick with the question and answer format. A Yes. Q I'll start by saying can you give me a summary of why in your opinion the Lawson systems do not have a catalog as the Court has defined that term? A Well, I think we should just go back to the
13 later on v 14 be able t 15 Q So w 16 non-infrir 17 A Well, 18 require a 19 products 20 requirem 21 Q Why 22 withdraw	when we get into the individual claims, I'll or give the other reasons. hat's reason No. 1 of your reasons for ingement? reason No. 1 is 11 out of the 12 claims reatalog or catalogs. And because Lawson's don't have a catalog, they can't satisfy the intents of at least 11 of the 12 claims. in your opinion do 11 of the 12 claims I'll it that.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	not have a catalog? A Yes. Right now we're Q I'll walk you through this step by step here and we'll stick with the question and answer format. A Yes. Q I'll start by saying can you give me a summary of why in your opinion the Lawson systems do not have a catalog as the Court has defined that term? A Well, I think we should just go back to the previous slide and go look through the Court's
13 later on v 14 be able t 15 Q So w 16 non-infrir 17 A Well, 18 require a 19 products 20 requirem 21 Q Why 22 withdraw 23 Why in	when we get into the individual claims, I'll o give the other reasons. hat's reason No. 1 of your reasons for agement? reason No. 1 is 11 out of the 12 claims a catalog or catalogs. And because Lawson's don't have a catalog, they can't satisfy the sents of at least 11 of the 12 claims. in your opinion do 11 of the 12 claims I'll	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	not have a catalog? A Yes. Right now we're Q I'll walk you through this step by step here and we'll stick with the question and answer format. A Yes. Q I'll start by saying can you give me a summary of why in your opinion the Lawson systems do not have a catalog as the Court has defined that term? A Well, I think we should just go back to the previous slide and go look through the Court's construction.

	17	50	17
1 t	that prong of the construction would be satisfied.		1 Q What sort of information does the item master have
2 E	But that information is not published by a vendor,		about a customer's inventory of a given item?
3 6	either a supplier, manufacturer or distributor. It's		3 A One piece of information is quantity on hand.
4 (carefully handpicked by a customer. A customer		4 Another piece of information that be where the item
5 0	decides what to import into that item master database,		5 can be found, where the inventory is physically
6 a	and it doesn't constitute a catalog or even multiple		6 located.
7 (catalogs.		7 Q When you say where it can be found or located, are
8 (Q What is your understanding as to what an item		8 you talking about where at the customer's premises it
9 r	master does in the Lawson systems?		9 could be located or something else?
10	A Item master, I think, is intended to represent the		10 A It may be that well, the customer is typically
11 ι	universe of items that an employee of a corporation is		11 going to have information about how much of that
12 a	able to buy regardless of what the source may be.		12 particular item he has on hand on his premises. He
13 (Q What's your understanding as to what sort of		13 generally doesn't know how much a vendor would have
14 i	information is in the item master in the Lawson		14 available.
15 s	systems?		15 Q Are you familiar with how the item descriptions
16 A	A It has information about items. It would have		16 are created for purposes of the item master?
	their name, it would have a catalog number, it may		17 A Not in detail. There's a field in item master
	have an identification of who's selling the item, an		18 that allows for a description of a product. Those
	identification of who manufactured the item. It has		descriptions can be imported from files provided by
	information about any special pricing terms that are		20 vendors or they can be hand created by the customer.
	available to this particular customer because of		21 Q Have you seen some documents in this case relating
	contracts that they may have entered into with		22 to Lawson where they refer to features of the Lawson
	suppliers, and other information that the user of the		23 systems in terms of being able to load vendor catalog
	system finds useful to associate with particular		24 data and the like?
	items.		25 A Yes.
	17	51	1
1 (17 Q Can you summarize for me the differences between	51	1 1 Q Given that those documents do use the term
		51	
2 t	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between	51	1 Q Given that those documents do use the term
2 t	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the	51	1 Q Given that those documents do use the term 2 "catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that
2 t 3 (Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it?	51	1 Q Given that those documents do use the term 2 "catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that 3 wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple
2 t 3 (Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information	51	1 Q Given that those documents do use the term 2 "catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that 3 wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple 4 catalogs?
2 t 3 0 4 4 5 a 6	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale.	51	1 Q Given that those documents do use the term 2 "catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that 3 wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple 4 catalogs? 5 MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that
2 t 3 4 4 5 6 7 8	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale. THE COURT: I've defined what a catalog is	51	1 Q Given that those documents do use the term 2 "catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that 3 wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple 4 catalogs? 5 MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that 6 question, Your Honor.
2 t 3 0 4 4 5 6 7 8	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale. THE COURT: I've defined what a catalog is and that's the end of it. Whether anybody agrees with	51	1 Q Given that those documents do use the term 2 "catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that 3 wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple 4 catalogs? 5 MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that 6 question, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: What is objectionable about the
2 t 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 i 9	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale. THE COURT: I've defined what a catalog is and that's the end of it. Whether anybody agrees with it, that's the catalog definition.		1 Q Given that those documents do use the term 2 "catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that 3 wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple 4 catalogs? 5 MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that 6 question, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: What is objectionable about the 8 form? That different documents have different reasons
2 t 3 0 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 i 9 10	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale. THE COURT: I've defined what a catalog is and that's the end of it. Whether anybody agrees with it, that's the catalog definition. MR. McDONALD: Sure.		1 Q Given that those documents do use the term 2 "catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that 3 wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple 4 catalogs? 5 MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that 6 question, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: What is objectionable about the 8 form? That different documents have different reasons 9 or that he can't testify to it or what?
2 t 3 (4 / 4 / 5 a 6 7 a 8 i 9 10 11 c 6	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale. THE COURT: I've defined what a catalog is and that's the end of it. Whether anybody agrees with it, that's the catalog definition. MR. McDONALD: Sure. THE COURT: We're not going to have him		1 Q Given that those documents do use the term 2 "catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that 3 wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple 4 catalogs? 5 MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that 6 question, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: What is objectionable about the 8 form? That different documents have different reasons 9 or that he can't testify to it or what? 10 MR. ROBERTSON: He can't testify and
2 t 3 (4 / 4 / 5 a 6 7 a 8 i 10 11 c 12	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale. THE COURT: I've defined what a catalog is and that's the end of it. Whether anybody agrees with it, that's the catalog definition. MR. McDONALD: Sure. THE COURT: We're not going to have him defining the catalogs. I've told you-all that before.		1 Q Given that those documents do use the term 2 "catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that 3 wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple 4 catalogs? 5 MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that 6 question, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: What is objectionable about the 8 form? That different documents have different reasons 9 or that he can't testify to it or what? 10 MR. ROBERTSON: He can't testify and 11 characterize what those documents mean and whether
2 t d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale. THE COURT: I've defined what a catalog is and that's the end of it. Whether anybody agrees with it, that's the catalog definition. MR. McDONALD: Sure. THE COURT: We're not going to have him defining the catalogs. I've told you-all that before. MR. McDONALD: That wasn't my intent. THE COURT: Well, he did. He started off		Catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple catalogs? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that question, Your Honor. THE COURT: What is objectionable about the form? That different documents have different reasons or that he can't testify to it or what? MR. ROBERTSON: He can't testify and characterize what those documents mean and whether they do doesn't mean they comply with the Court's
2 t d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale. THE COURT: I've defined what a catalog is and that's the end of it. Whether anybody agrees with it, that's the catalog definition. MR. McDONALD: Sure. THE COURT: We're not going to have him defining the catalogs. I've told you-all that before. MR. McDONALD: That wasn't my intent. THE COURT: Well, he did. He started off defining it. So let's don't have it. And I don't		Catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple catalogs? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that question, Your Honor. THE COURT: What is objectionable about the form? That different documents have different reasons or that he can't testify to it or what? MR. ROBERTSON: He can't testify and characterize what those documents mean and whether they do doesn't mean they comply with the Court's claim construction because they use the term "catalog."
2 t d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale. THE COURT: I've defined what a catalog is and that's the end of it. Whether anybody agrees with it, that's the catalog definition. MR. McDONALD: Sure. THE COURT: We're not going to have him defining the catalogs. I've told you-all that before. MR. McDONALD: That wasn't my intent. THE COURT: Well, he did. He started off defining it. So let's don't have it. And I don't really want to have to deal with this problem, Mr.		Catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple catalogs? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that question, Your Honor. THE COURT: What is objectionable about the form? That different documents have different reasons or that he can't testify to it or what? MR. ROBERTSON: He can't testify and characterize what those documents mean and whether they do doesn't mean they comply with the Court's claim construction because they use the term "catalog." THE COURT: So the objection to the form of
2 t d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale. THE COURT: I've defined what a catalog is and that's the end of it. Whether anybody agrees with it, that's the catalog definition. MR. McDONALD: Sure. THE COURT: We're not going to have him defining the catalogs. I've told you-all that before. MR. McDONALD: That wasn't my intent. THE COURT: Well, he did. He started off defining it. So let's don't have it. And I don't really want to have to deal with this problem, Mr.		Catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple catalogs? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that question, Your Honor. THE COURT: What is objectionable about the form? That different documents have different reasons or that he can't testify to it or what? MR. ROBERTSON: He can't testify and characterize what those documents mean and whether they do doesn't mean they comply with the Court's claim construction because they use the term "catalog." THE COURT: So the objection to the form of the question is that he doesn't have any basis for
2 t t 3 (4 / 5 a 6 6 7 a 6 i 10 11 a 6 1 11 a 6 i 11 11 a 6 i 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 1	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale. THE COURT: I've defined what a catalog is and that's the end of it. Whether anybody agrees with it, that's the catalog definition. MR. McDONALD: Sure. THE COURT: We're not going to have him defining the catalogs. I've told you-all that before. MR. McDONALD: That wasn't my intent. THE COURT: Well, he did. He started off defining it. So let's don't have it. And I don't really want to have to deal with this problem, Mr. McDonald. He can testify, but I don't want to have to be constantly monitoring whether there's compliance		1 Q Given that those documents do use the term 2 "catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that 3 wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple 4 catalogs? 5 MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that 6 question, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: What is objectionable about the 8 form? That different documents have different reasons 9 or that he can't testify to it or what? 10 MR. ROBERTSON: He can't testify and 11 characterize what those documents mean and whether 12 they do doesn't mean they comply with the Court's 13 claim construction because they use the term 14 "catalog." 15 THE COURT: So the objection to the form of 16 the question is that he doesn't have any basis for 17 knowing what the author of a particular document
2 t d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale. THE COURT: I've defined what a catalog is and that's the end of it. Whether anybody agrees with it, that's the catalog definition. MR. McDONALD: Sure. THE COURT: We're not going to have him defining the catalogs. I've told you-all that before. MR. McDONALD: That wasn't my intent. THE COURT: Well, he did. He started off defining it. So let's don't have it. And I don't really want to have to deal with this problem, Mr. McDonald. He can testify, but I don't want to have to be constantly monitoring whether there's compliance with the requirement that the terms are those defined		Catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple catalogs? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that question, Your Honor. THE COURT: What is objectionable about the form? That different documents have different reasons or that he can't testify to it or what? MR. ROBERTSON: He can't testify and characterize what those documents mean and whether they do doesn't mean they comply with the Court's claim construction because they use the term "catalog." THE COURT: So the objection to the form of the question is that he doesn't have any basis for knowing what the author of a particular document meant. Is that right, Mr. Robertson?
2 t d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale. THE COURT: I've defined what a catalog is and that's the end of it. Whether anybody agrees with it, that's the catalog definition. MR. McDONALD: Sure. THE COURT: We're not going to have him defining the catalogs. I've told you-all that before. MR. McDONALD: That wasn't my intent. THE COURT: Well, he did. He started off defining it. So let's don't have it. And I don't really want to have to deal with this problem, Mr. McDonald. He can testify, but I don't want to have to be constantly monitoring whether there's compliance with the requirement that the terms are those defined by the Court.		"catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple catalogs? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that question, Your Honor. THE COURT: What is objectionable about the form? That different documents have different reasons or that he can't testify to it or what? MR. ROBERTSON: He can't testify and characterize what those documents mean and whether they do doesn't mean they comply with the Court's claim construction because they use the term "catalog." THE COURT: So the objection to the form of the question is that he doesn't have any basis for knowing what the author of a particular document meant. Is that right, Mr. Robertson? MR. ROBERTSON: Yes. Thank you for
2 t d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale. THE COURT: I've defined what a catalog is and that's the end of it. Whether anybody agrees with it, that's the catalog definition. MR. McDONALD: Sure. THE COURT: We're not going to have him defining the catalogs. I've told you-all that before. MR. McDONALD: That wasn't my intent. THE COURT: Well, he did. He started off defining it. So let's don't have it. And I don't really want to have to deal with this problem, Mr. McDonald. He can testify, but I don't want to have to be constantly monitoring whether there's compliance with the requirement that the terms are those defined by the Court. BY MR. McDONALD:		"catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple catalogs? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that question, Your Honor. THE COURT: What is objectionable about the form? That different documents have different reasons or that he can't testify to it or what? MR. ROBERTSON: He can't testify and characterize what those documents mean and whether they do doesn't mean they comply with the Court's claim construction because they use the term "catalog." THE COURT: So the objection to the form of the question is that he doesn't have any basis for knowing what the author of a particular document meant. Is that right, Mr. Robertson? MR. ROBERTSON: Yes. Thank you for articulating that for me, sir.
2 t t 3 (4 / 4 / 5 a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale. THE COURT: I've defined what a catalog is and that's the end of it. Whether anybody agrees with it, that's the catalog definition. MR. McDONALD: Sure. THE COURT: We're not going to have him defining the catalogs. I've told you-all that before. MR. McDONALD: That wasn't my intent. THE COURT: Well, he did. He started off defining it. So let's don't have it. And I don't really want to have to deal with this problem, Mr. McDonald. He can testify, but I don't want to have to be constantly monitoring whether there's compliance with the requirement that the terms are those defined by the Court. BY MR. McDONALD: Q Do you have an understanding as to whether or not		"catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple catalogs? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that question, Your Honor. THE COURT: What is objectionable about the form? That different documents have different reasons or that he can't testify to it or what? MR. ROBERTSON: He can't testify and characterize what those documents mean and whether they do doesn't mean they comply with the Court's claim construction because they use the term "catalog." THE COURT: So the objection to the form of the question is that he doesn't have any basis for knowing what the author of a particular document meant. Is that right, Mr. Robertson? MR. ROBERTSON: Yes. Thank you for articulating that for me, sir. THE COURT: What's your response to that, Mr.
2 t t 3 (4 / 4 / 5 a 4 / 4 / 5 a 4 / 4 / 5 a 4 / 4 / 6 / 6 / 7 a 4 / 6 / 6 / 7 a 4 / 6 / 6 / 6 / 6 / 6 / 6 / 6 / 6 / 6 /	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale. THE COURT: I've defined what a catalog is and that's the end of it. Whether anybody agrees with it, that's the catalog definition. MR. McDONALD: Sure. THE COURT: We're not going to have him defining the catalogs. I've told you-all that before. MR. McDONALD: That wasn't my intent. THE COURT: Well, he did. He started off defining it. So let's don't have it. And I don't really want to have to deal with this problem, Mr. McDonald. He can testify, but I don't want to have to be constantly monitoring whether there's compliance with the requirement that the terms are those defined by the Court. BY MR. McDONALD: Q Do you have an understanding as to whether or not the item master in the Lawson systems includes		"catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple catalogs? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that question, Your Honor. THE COURT: What is objectionable about the form? That different documents have different reasons or that he can't testify to it or what? MR. ROBERTSON: He can't testify and characterize what those documents mean and whether they do doesn't mean they comply with the Court's claim construction because they use the term "catalog." THE COURT: So the objection to the form of the question is that he doesn't have any basis for knowing what the author of a particular document meant. Is that right, Mr. Robertson? MR. ROBERTSON: Yes. Thank you for articulating that for me, sir. THE COURT: What's your response to that, Mr. McDonald?
2 tt 3 (4 / 4 / 5 a i 6 7 a i 6 7 a i 7 a	Q Can you summarize for me the differences between the Lawson systems item master and catalogs as the Court construed it? A Well, a catalog is a compendium of information about the things that a vendor is offering for sale. THE COURT: I've defined what a catalog is and that's the end of it. Whether anybody agrees with it, that's the catalog definition. MR. McDONALD: Sure. THE COURT: We're not going to have him defining the catalogs. I've told you-all that before. MR. McDONALD: That wasn't my intent. THE COURT: Well, he did. He started off defining it. So let's don't have it. And I don't really want to have to deal with this problem, Mr. McDonald. He can testify, but I don't want to have to be constantly monitoring whether there's compliance with the requirement that the terms are those defined by the Court. BY MR. McDONALD: Q Do you have an understanding as to whether or not		 "catalogs," why is it that you concluded that that wouldn't indicate that the item master has multiple catalogs? MR. ROBERTSON: Objection to the form of that question, Your Honor. THE COURT: What is objectionable about the form? That different documents have different reasons or that he can't testify to it or what? MR. ROBERTSON: He can't testify and characterize what those documents mean and whether they do doesn't mean they comply with the Court's claim construction because they use the term "catalog." THE COURT: So the objection to the form of the question is that he doesn't have any basis for knowing what the author of a particular document meant. Is that right, Mr. Robertson? MR. ROBERTSON: Yes. Thank you for articulating that for me, sir. THE COURT: What's your response to that, Mr.

2011.01.21 Trial Transcript Day 12 1/21/2011 8:22:00 PM

		2797			2
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		1	PROCEEDINGS	
2	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA RICHMOND DIVISION		2		
1	NOTIVIONE DIVISION		3	THE CLERK: Civil action number 3:09CV00620, ePlus,	
5			4	Incorporated, versus Lawson Software, Incorporated. Mr. Scott	
6 e	: PLUS, INC. : Civil Action No.		5	L. Robertson, Mr. Craig T. Merritt, Ms. Jennifer A. Albert, and	
, ,	: 3:09CV620				
' V:	s. :		6	Mr. Michael G. Strapp represent the plaintiffs.	
3 L	: AWSON SOFTWARE, INC. : January 21, 2011		7	Mr. Daniel W. McDonald, Mr. Dabney J. Carr, IV, Ms.	
_	:		8	Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Mr. William D. Schultz, and Ms. Rachel	
,			9	Hughey represent the defendant. Are counsel ready to proceed?	
0 1	COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF THE JURY TRIAL		10	MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, Your Honor.	
2	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. PAYNE		11	MR. McDONALD: Yes, Your Honor.	
3	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, AND A JURY		12	THE COURT: All right. We'll take plaintiff's JMOL	
1 Al	PPEARANCES:		13	motion first.	
5					
	cott L. Robertson, Esquire		14	MR. ROBERTSON: Good morning, Your Honor.	
	lichael G. Strapp, Esquire ennifer A. Albert, Esquire		15	THE COURT: Good morning.	
7 Da	avid M. Young, Esquire		16	MR. ROBERTSON: I'm going to be arguing plaintiff's	
	oodwin Procter, LLP		17	judgment as a matter of law with respect to infringement, and	
	01 New York Avenue NW uite 900		18	Ms. Albert will be addressing plaintiff's judgment as a matter	
) W	/ashington, D.C. 20001		19	of law with respect to the invalidity issues.	
	raig T. Merritt, Esquire hristian & Barton, LLP		20	Your Honor, Rule 50 provides that judgment as a	
	09 East Main Street				
Sı	uite 1200		21	matter of law may be granted when a reasonable jury would not	
	ichmond, Virginia 23219-3095		22	have a legally sufficient evidentiary basis to find for the	
3	ounsel for the plaintiff		23	party Lawson on that issue. ePlus moves for JMOL that Lawson	
1	Peppy Peterson, RPR		24	infringes all the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit, both	
5	Official Court Reporter United States District Court		25	directly and indirectly, both through inducement of	
		2798			2
	DDEADANGES (#)				_
	PPEARANCES: (cont'g)		1	infringement and contributory infringement.	
	abney J. Carr, IV, Esquire routman Sanders, LLP		2	I'm not going to go through all the asserted claims,	
	routman Sanders Building		3	Your Honor. I know Your Honor is familiar with them, and that	
	2001 Haxall Point		4	would just take up too much time, and I know we're pressed for	
	ichmond, Virginia 23219		5	time here this morning with the Court's schedule this	
	aniel W. McDonald, Esquire		6	afternoon, but let me hit a high point, first start off by	
	irstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire		7	saying, we contend that the defendants non-infringement case in	
W	/illiam D. Schultz, Esquire				
	erchant & Gould, PC		8	this proceeding has been really based on misdirection, that	
80	3 South Eighth Street		9	they have ignored the Court's claim construction with respect	
Sı	uite 3200		10	to catalog. They rewrote the provision for published by a	
М	linneapolis, Minnesota 55402		11	vendor to suit their manufactured non-infringement positions.	
			12	It required the Court, I think midcourse through this	
)			13	case, to issue the instruction with respect to published by a	
			14	vendor to bring some clarity to what the Court intended when it	
2				•	
3			15	gave its instruction with respect to what a catalog is.	
			16	It did not mean, as the defendant contended, that the	
5			17	item data associated with the catalog could not be selected	
			18	or had to be selected by the customer or modified or deleted or	
6			19	reformatted or be an entire catalog. That was never intended	
;				by the Court, and its revised published-by-a-vendor	
6 7 8			20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
6 7 8				construction made that clear, and I think the arguments made on	
6 7 3 9			21	construction made that clear, and I think the arguments made on	
6 7 3 9			21 22	that, the non-infringement arguments that were based on that	
6 7 3 9 0 1			21 22 23		
6 7 3 9 0 1			21 22	that, the non-infringement arguments that were based on that	

2011.01.21 Trial Transcript Day 12 1/21/2011 8:22:00 PM

met there is no infringement that, and 10,000 vendors and you don't have a catalog of what's 1 2 To answer your question, I do agree with ePlus's in there just because it came from multiple sources. That's 3 position that capability allows for infringement. The second what you are saying. You're saying you can't -- you don't have a catalog because it came from 10.000 different vendors or a question with respect to the specific issue of catalogs is that here, there is no catalog. Like I said, both parties agree 6 that at some point data that's been drawn from a catalog, a 6 MS. HUGHEY: No, that's not why it's not a catalog. vendor catalog and changed is not a catalog. It's not a catalog because it doesn't meet the Court's 7 THE COURT: But you don't even agree if I put my definition of catalog. The Court's definition of catalog 9 whole catalog in, that I've got a catalog in the item master requires an organized collection of items and associated information published by a vendor. 10 10 11 MS. HUGHEY: I would agree that that would be an 11 At no point was any of the information pulled from a infringement if that happened, but it does not, nor is it 12 catalog and then transformed, as we've gone through in great 12 detail, and then put into the item master, also known as a capable of happening. That's my point. 13 13 14 THE COURT: Why isn't it capable of happening? In 14 fact, every witness that testified said it is, including Mr 15 THE COURT: In fact, that's exactly what Mr. 15 Christopherson. What he said was, in words of one syllable, 16 Christopherson said did happen under the ETL process that he 16 17 sure, that can done, but that isn't the way it's usually used. testified to in connection with this exhibit, and the T in that 18 That's what he said. 18 is transformation. That is exactly what he did. 19 MS. HUGHEY: The transformation is the whole point of 19 MS. HUGHEY: The evidence that was coming in was that 20 the item master -- all the evidence that came in about the item 20 change. There is a -- everyone agrees that the Sears catalog 21 master is that it is uniquely organized and created by a 21 or the Montgomery Ward catalog is a catalog. It comes from customer, it does not look like a published catalog, it's a 22 that point, it is -- it is changed and then put in the item 22 23 private collection of personal items, has special price 23 master like a grocery list. That is the T. That is what we're 24 information. These are not -- this is a not a catalog, a 24 talking about. It's not the same. vendor catalog like the Sears catalog. This is a grocery list. 25 THE COURT: I don't understand why it isn't. 25 2830 2832 1 THE COURT: That isn't the question. Your witness MS. HUGHEY: It's not the same because it doesn't testified that the -- that I could put one or more entire meet the Court's definition of catalog. The Court's definition of catalog is an organized collection of items and associated 3 catalogs into the item master if I wanted to depending on the 3 capacity of the item master I bought, and your position is that information published by a vendor. even if I do that, the item master parts list, vendor item list 5 THE COURT: What is wrong with that? You can't just isn't a catalog, and I don't understand that at all. 6 cite the whole thing. You now need to tell me what part of the 6 MS. HUGHEY: Your Honor, the evidence that came into definition it doesn't fit 8 this case is that the item master is like a grocery list, and MS. HUGHEY: Yes. Specifically the published by a 9 so, yes, people were saying in theory -- in context, they were 9 vendor. It requires the items --10 talking about what kind of information could be drawn in, but 10 THE COURT: Why isn't it published by a vendor? 11 in reality, all the evidence came in that that item master is a 11 MS. HUGHEY: The items in the item master have never 12 been published by a vendor. 12 grocery list. It is not a catalog. 13 THE COURT: What about something -- you make it sound 13 THE COURT: Of course they have. Where did they come like a grocery list that my wife goes to the store or sends me 14 from in the first place? 15 to the store with a list of 20 items. There are hundreds of 15 MS_HUGHEY: There was a published vendor catalog 16 thousands of items in most of these item masters, and they 16 THE COURT: And that was published by the vendor. came -- all that information came from vendors, and it was --17 MS. HUGHEY: That was 17 THE COURT: Then I go to the catalog, I look at it. 18 and the information -- your user transformed some of it, edited 18 19 some of it and moved some of it, gave some information that's 19 and then I have Remmington shotgun model 12 in there. Well, my 20 not in the catalog such as price because they worked out a 20 system won't take a Remmington shotgun model 12, so what I do 21 is I take that vendor information, and I transform it to RSG 21 special price deal, but what's in the catalog that is created by the item master is the price, or what's in the item master, 22 and 12 so it will fit the number of characters 23 whatever you want to call it, is the price, for example, 23 All I've done is transformed the exact data, loaded

Now, I don't understand how you can have something

that's a hundred thousand items, or in many instances more than

24

24

that into my system, and I have my own little catalog there

If I want a AK-47 and a Berretta and a long gun, and I take

2011.01.21 Trial Transcript Day 12 1/21/2011 8:22:00 PM

		2011.0			
		2849			285
1	THE COURT: Is that what the case holds? That's what		1	THE COURT: All right.	
2	this case holds that's what this case about the travel		2	MS. HUGHEY: Hello, Your Honor. May it	
3	candle holds, that, in fact, there was no evidence that the		3	please the Court. Lawson moves for judgment as a	
4	travel candle was used in the infringing way.		4	matter of law on the issue of invalidity because a	
5	MR. ROBERTSON: There's amble evidence in this case		5	reasonable jury does not have a reasonable evidentiary	
6	that it's used in the infringing way, both from Mr.		6	basis to find for ePlus on the issue.	
7	Christopherson and		7	At trial documents demonstrated and witnesses	
8	THE COURT: Here's the bottom line. I'm the finder		8	testified	
9	of the fact. I would clearly find that there is infringement		9	THE COURT: Now, there are three grounds of	
10	of everything that Dr. Weaver said, that each system infringed		10	invalidity. One is anticipation.	
11	each claim for the reasons he stated. There isn't any question		11	MS. HUGHEY: Correct.	
12	that I would do that.		12	THE COURT: One is obviousness.	
13	But I'm not the finder of the fact. So under these		13	MS. HUGHEY: Correct.	
14	facts, under the evidence in this case, don't I have to let the		14	THE COURT: And the other is written	
15	jury decide that case and then come back at the end of the day		15	description.	
16	and see whether that's right? So what I'm inclined to do is		16	MS. HUGHEY: No, Your Honor, Lawson is not	
17	reserve judgment on this motion, because I will tell you I		17	asserting written description.	
18	personally am having real trouble deciding why there's any		18	THE COURT: That was there at one time.	
19	defense to infringement at all.		19	MS. HUGHEY: Correct.	
20	MR. ROBERTSON: I understand.		20	THE COURT: That's no longer there. So I	
21	THE COURT: But I believe that I do have to let the		21	don't need to deal with that one.	
22	case go to the jury subject to my ability to control that, and		22	MS. HUGHEY: Correct.	
23	I'm going to take this motion under advisement, deny the motion		23	THE COURT: So you have anticipation and	
24			24	obviousness.	
25	of no infringement by Lawson, keep your motion under advisement.		25	MS. HUGHEY: Correct, Your Honor. At trial	
			20		
		2850			285
1	MR. ROBERTSON: I understand, Your Honor. Thank you.		1	the documents demonstrated and the witnesses testified	
2	THE COURT: All right, now, invalidity. I believe		2	regarding the features and functionality of the prior	
3	that Ms. Hughey, are you doing that one, too?		3	art RIMS system disclosed in the '989 patent.	
4	MS. HUGHEY: I am, Your Honor, and I promise to be		4	THE COURT: Let's take the anticipation.	
5	much slower this time.		5	What is it that anticipates?	
6	THE COURT: Because if you don't, you're going to get		6	MS. HUGHEY: The RIMS system alone	
7	knee-capped but not buy me.		7	anticipates every single claim of the patents-in-suit.	
8	Let's see. Is this a good place for the court		8	THE COURT: All right.	
9	reporters to switch and for us to take a little recess?		9	MS. HUGHEY: In combination, the RIMS system	
10	(Passas takan)		10	and the TV/2 product render every single one of the	
11	(Recess taken.)		11	claims of the patents-in-suit obvious.	
12			12	Dr. Shamos went through every single claim	
13			13	and explained both the anticipation and obviousness	
14			14	analysis. The evidence at trial further demonstrated	
4 =			15	that both systems are prior art.	
15			16	The combination of RIMS plus TV/2 renders	
16			10		
			17	every single asserted claim of the patents-in-suit	
16				every single asserted claim of the patents-in-suit obvious. The preferred embodiment disclosed in the	
16 17			17	, -	
16 17 18			17 18	obvious. The preferred embodiment disclosed in the	
16 17 18 19			17 18 19	obvious. The preferred embodiment disclosed in the patents is the combination of RIMS plus TV/2 and the	
16 17 18 19 20			17 18 19 20	obvious. The preferred embodiment disclosed in the patents is the combination of RIMS plus TV/2 and the Court's construction is consistent with that.	
16 17 18 19 20 21			17 18 19 20 21	obvious. The preferred embodiment disclosed in the patents is the combination of RIMS plus TV/2 and the Court's construction is consistent with that. The TV/2 literature specifically says to	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22			17 18 19 20 21 22	obvious. The preferred embodiment disclosed in the patents is the combination of RIMS plus TV/2 and the Court's construction is consistent with that. The TV/2 literature specifically says to combine TV/2 with the parts ordering system and	

2011.01.24 Trial Transcript Day 13 1/24/2011 2:45:00 PM

doesn't contain the sixth, then it doesn't infringe, so it has of the rights that ePlus has in its patents, that anybody has 1 2 in their patents. to have them all There also are method claims, and those, in this Now, those instructions -- I mean those patents are case, are claims 26, 28, and 29 of the '683 patent, and that in your notebook, and each of the claims that are at issue are 4 5 method claim recites a series of steps that have to be highlighted in yellow, and I've defined the claim terms, and performed, and to infringe a method claim, it must be proved you have to use those terms, and they are in your notebook as 6 that use of an accused system performs each of the steps as well, and you use those same definitions in deciding both 7 defined in the claim, and, again, they have to prove all of it. infringement and invalidity. And the definitions are those as 9 If they only prove one out of five, then that's not enough. If would be given and are understood by one of ordinary skill in 10 they prove five out of six, that's not enough. 10 the art, and you've heard people talking about. 11 Now, you've also heard some evidence from the experts 11 One of the few things that I think the parties agreed about independent and dependent claims. An independent claim 12 upon in this case is who was the person of ordinary skill in 12 simply recites its own elements or steps and does not refer to the art, and that is someone in the field of computer science 13 13 14 any other claim. A dependent claim includes all the elements 14 with an undergraduate Bachelor of Science degree and some or steps of another claim, that is the claim from which it 15 practical programming experience, perhaps about a year or two, 15 depends, plus one or more other elements or steps. 16 and having an understanding of the basic principles of supply 16 17 So it will say a system comprising or a method chain management and procurement during the 1993 to mid 1994 18 comprising or method for doing this as recited in claim one 18 time frame 19 which also, or that also does, and that's a dependent claim If the Court has not given you a definition, then the 19 20 because it recites the claim that it comes from 20 words of a claim are to be given their usual and ordinary 21 A dependent claim, of course, is infringed only if 21 meanings. The parts of the patent that precede the claim are 22 all elements or the steps of the independent claim, as well as 22 called the abstract, and I believe somebody pointed that out to 23 the other element listed in the dependent claim, are shown to 23 you -- that has some evidentiary value, of course, because it 24 exist in an accused system or method. So in other words, to 24 tells you things -- and the written description or 25 prove infringement of the dependent claim, you have to prove, specification, but neither the written description nor the

> 3247 3249

A, that all of the elements of the claim from which it depends 1 are infringed and the one which is new as well. Now, the

dependent claims at issue in this case are claim 29 of the '683 3

patent, and claims two, six, and 22 of the '516 patent.

that, all of this is recited for you in instruction number 17 so you can identify, but you can also tell by the language they

And all of the other claims here are independent

These instructions are numbered. If you need to know

8

5

6

9

17

18

19

20

21

22

10 claims. The claims here, all of them actually, whether they are system claims or method claims, use the term comprising. 11 Comprising simply means including but not limited to or 12 13 contain. Thus, claims that contain the word comprising cover any accused system or method that includes the elements of the 15 claims even if that accused method or system includes

16 additional functionality or steps.

> What is important is whether the accused system or method of a claim using the term comprising includes all the elements of the claim. If it does, then infringement is proved even if the accused system or method includes even more functionality or features.

> > Now, to decide the issues of infringement and

and was in the video before, the claims define the boundaries

23 invalidity, you're going to need to understand the claims of the patents because as both lawyers. I think, have pointed out 24

abstract nor the drawings, which are called figures, can be

infringed. The infringement is of the claims, not the things

that precede the claims, and that's what you are looking at.

The term published by a vendor was used, and I'll remind you of that definition. I think they read it, and you

probably have it perfectly in mind now, but published by a

vendor is used in the definition of the claim term

catalog/product catalog

9 Published simply means to make generally known. 10 Published by a vendor simply means that at some point in time,

11

a vendor, such as a supplier, a manufacturer, or a distributor,

has made generally known or has disclosed an organized 12

collection of items and associated information, preferably but

not necessarily including the part number, price, catalog

15 number, vendor name, vendor ID, a textual description of the

16 items, and images of or relating to the item.

17 Now, two of the claims here contain what is referred 18 to as means for performing a stated function in the elements.

19 and you've got those interpreted in your book as well. Claim

20 three of the '683 patent and claim one of the '172 patent have

21 elements that also include the means plus function

22

23 That term, means for, has a special meaning in patent

One example is that claim three of the '683 patent uses 24

the phrase means for selecting the product catalogs to search.

2011.01.24 Trial Transcript Day 13 1/24/2011 2:45:00 PM

		3078			308
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		1	PROCEEDINGS	
2 3	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA RICHMOND DIVISION		2		
4	MOTIVIONE DIVISION		3	THE CLERK: Civil action number 3:09CV00620, ePlus,	
5	·		4	Incorporated versus Lawson Software, Incorporated. Mr. Scott	
6	ePLUS, INC. : Civil Action No.		5	L. Robertson, Mr. Craig T. Merritt, Ms. Jennifer A. Albert, and	
7	: 3:09CV620 vs. :		6	Mr. Michael G. Strapp represent the plaintiff.	
,	:		7	Mr. Daniel W. McDonald, Mr. Dabney J. Carr, IV, Ms.	
8	LAWSON SOFTWARE, INC. : January 24, 2011		8	Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Mr. William D. Schultz represent the	
9	·		9	defendant. Are counsel ready to proceed?	
10 11	COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF THE JURY TRIAL		10	MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, Your Honor.	
12	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. PAYNE		11	MR. McDONALD: Yes, Your Honor.	
13 14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, AND A JURY		12	THE COURT: All right. I was very sorry to hear	
	APPEARANCES:		13	about Ms. Albert's father passing away. You all both wrote	
15	Scott L. Robertson, Esquire		14	letters about it. I don't see the point in bringing that to	
16	Michael G. Strapp, Esquire		15	the attention the jury. Do either one of you?	
17	David M. Young, Esquire Goodwin Procter, LLP		16	In the old days, when people didn't do what they were	
	901 New York Avenue NW		17	supposed to do, they got keelhauled. I'm about ready to	
18	Suite 900 Washington, D.C. 20001		18	institute that procedure here. It's time for the jury to get	
19			19	going, and I've had to read all this stuff now. I told you	
20	Craig T. Merritt, Esquire Christian & Barton, LLP		20	what to do about this verdict form, and it was pretty easy, and	
	909 East Main Street		21	it's unnecessary to go through all this stuff.	
21	Suite 1200 Richmond, Virginia 23219-3095		22	Now, apparently we're going to have to revise it	
22	Counsel for the plaintiff		23	anyway because and some of the instructions. What	
23 24	Peppy Peterson, RPR		24	instructions have to be revised because Lawson is not	
25	Official Court Reporter United States District Court		25	contending that the RIMS brochure is prior art? Which one is	
		3079			308
1	ADDEADANCES: (contin)				
	APPEARANCES: (cont'g)		1	arguing?	
2	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire				
2			1 2 3	arguing? MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the	
	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building		2	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the	
3	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point		2	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS	
3	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219		2 3 4	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it	
3	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point		2 3 4 5	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated	
3 4 5	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire		2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.	
3 4 5	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form. THE COURT: Is that right?	
3 4 5	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street		2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form. THE COURT: Is that right? MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor.	
3 4 5 6	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form. THE COURT: Is that right? MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor. THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury	
33 4 55 66 77	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form. THE COURT: Is that right? MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor. THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form. THE COURT: Is that right? MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor. THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art.	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form. THE COURT: Is that right? MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor. THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art. MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form. THE COURT: Is that right? MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor. THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art. MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're	
3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 11 12	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form. THE COURT: Is that right? MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor. THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art. MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form. THE COURT: Is that right? MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor. THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art. MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form. THE COURT: Is that right? MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor. THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art. MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by itself, we're not contending is an anticipating reference, but	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form. THE COURT: Is that right? MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor. THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art. MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by itself, we're not contending is an anticipating reference, but it would be used to support number one in the instruction which	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form. THE COURT: Is that right? MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor. THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art. MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by itself, we're not contending is an anticipating reference, but it would be used to support number one in the instruction which is the Fisher RIMS system as prior art.	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form. THE COURT: Is that right? MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor. THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art. MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by itself, we're not contending is an anticipating reference, but it would be used to support number one in the instruction which is the Fisher RIMS system as prior art. THE COURT: What do you mean, to be used to support?	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form. THE COURT: Is that right? MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor. THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art. MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by itself, we're not contending is an anticipating reference, but it would be used to support number one in the instruction which is the Fisher RIMS system as prior art. THE COURT: What do you mean, to be used to support? If you're going to use it	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form. THE COURT: Is that right? MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor. THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art. MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by itself, we're not contending is an anticipating reference, but it would be used to support number one in the instruction which is the Fisher RIMS system as prior art. THE COURT: What do you mean, to be used to support? If you're going to use it MR. McDONALD: It's evidence of the Fisher RIMS	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 12 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22 23	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form. THE COURT: Is that right? MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor. THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art. MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by itself, we're not contending is an anticipating reference, but it would be used to support number one in the instruction which is the Fisher RIMS system as prior art. THE COURT: What do you mean, to be used to support? If you're going to use it MR. McDONALD: It's evidence of the Fisher RIMS system as it was being sold and	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form. THE COURT: Is that right? MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor. THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art. MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by itself, we're not contending is an anticipating reference, but it would be used to support number one in the instruction which is the Fisher RIMS system as prior art. THE COURT: What do you mean, to be used to support? If you're going to use it MR. McDONALD: It's evidence of the Fisher RIMS	